



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The golden Bucentaur is again waiting at the steps of the Piazzetta, that the Doge and the magnificos of his court may embark. But the dreamer's reverie is broken; the pageants of the past have vanished; from the distant mainland a war-like din announces the conquering march of Napoleon Bonaparte, and over the watery waste of the Lagoon, impregnable no longer, sounds the doom of Venice in the harsh roll of his battle-drums. Here we bid farewell to the Queen of the Adriatic. Fallen, but majestic still, she yet has, for lovers of her romantic story, an unparalleled fascination, so happily described by that poet who more than any other, with the exception of Tasso, has entwined his name with the memories of Venice:—

“Perchance even dearer in her day of woe,  
Than when she was a boast, a marvel, and a show.”

---

- ART. V.—1. *The Census of Ireland for 1851.* Parts V. and VI. *General Report, and Tables of Deaths.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament. Dublin. 1856.
2. *History of the Irish Poor-Laws in Connection with the Condition of the People.* By SIR GEORGE NICHOLS, K. C. B. London. 1856.
3. *The Irish Church.* Speech of EDWARD MIALL, ESQ., Member for Rochdale, delivered in the House of Commons, May 22, 1856. London: Effingham Wilson.

FOR centuries it has been the habit with writers in the interest of the British government to treat the condition of Ireland as an abstruse problem,—regarding the poverty and sufferings of the people as almost impenetrable mysteries. It is otherwise, however, when anything appears that can be called an improvement. If a cause is assigned for Irish misery, it is sure to be connected in some manner with the people themselves; the blame is theirs, and theirs only, if blame there be. Either they have brought their misfortunes on themselves directly, by their bad conduct, their imprudence, their

indolence, or all together; otherwise the hand of a mysterious Providence is to be traced in all that has befallen them. But if there is the slightest amelioration in their condition; if the smallest gleam penetrates the gloom in which they are shrouded; if they cease to suffer, or have an interval of ease; if they are not hungry and naked to-day as they were yesterday,—let no one think that the credit is their own. It was, forsooth, the last act of Parliament, the last concession of a wise and paternal government, that brought about the change. If Irishmen attempt to tell their own story, and trace effects to their causes, they do so at their peril. The chances are ten to one that they will be prosecuted for sedition, and fined or imprisoned, or both; or if they escape, perchance, the action of the law, when it is not convenient to have packed juries, it is, perhaps, only to be ruined by different means. It is notorious, on the other hand, that the government bribes the Irish press whenever it can. The case of the *Dublin World*, whose proprietor, Mr. Birch, was salaried by Lord Clarendon, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, is still familiar to all. Papers bought up in this manner will of course say whatever is required. They will call black white, or white black, according as they are directed. They will give glowing accounts of the progress made under the “excellent administration” which furnishes the cash. These accounts are copied by the *Times* and *Globe* as “the spirit of the Irish press”; as conclusive evidence that all the Irish need under British rule is to exert themselves, in order to be as happy and prosperous as their neighbors. If a Frenchman or a German writes a book on Ireland, he is seldom translated; or if he gets a hearing in the English language, his statements are attributed to prejudice, envy, or ignorance, for the simple reason, that, in giving a fair account of what he has seen, he has imputed the blame of it to England; that is, he has told at least a portion of the truth as to the real character of English domination in Ireland. From these facts it will not be difficult to comprehend how it is that the grievances under which the Irish people still labor are so little understood in this country.

Our object in the present article is to give our readers as fair an idea as possible of the case as it stands, between Eng-

land and Ireland, in the belief that the American people have an interest in the question scarcely second to that which is felt by the English themselves. In undertaking this task, we would gladly draw a veil over the past, partly because it is painful to contemplate the sufferings which the Irish people have endured for nearly five centuries, and partly because we have no wish to revive the memory of the dark catalogue of cruel wrongs which England has inflicted on Ireland. We would gladly confine ourselves to whatever is cheering and hopeful in the present condition of the country; but in speaking of improvement it is necessary to give some idea of its elements, and of the extent to which it has been carried; and this cannot be done without reference to the past. In comparing the present of Ireland with its recent past, the philanthropist has much reason for gratification; but compared with almost any other people in Christendom, the Irish have still a hard lot; in short, their prosperity and happiness consist in little more than in not being hungry and cold, or in any immediate danger of dying of starvation, as their neighbors and kindred did during the famine by hundreds of thousands.

There is no parallel in the annals of oppression for the penal laws of Ireland, so justly described by Burke as "a horrible and impious system of servitude"; and many of these laws had been in operation long before the Reformation,—before any such excuse as that founded in our own times on religious prejudices could have been adduced. So far back as the time of Henry III., it was made a crime for the Irish to have schools.\* The famous statute of Kilkenny was passed in 1361, in the reign of Edward III. In this curious document it was declared that "fostering" and intermarriage with the natives should be regarded as high treason, and punished accordingly; and that any person of English descent who should assume an Irish name, speak the Irish language, or adopt the laws, customs, or dress of the natives, should forfeit his lands or be imprisoned.† Subsequently, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Henry VIII., a law was passed restraining the Irish from having themselves shorn or shaven

---

\* Thierry's *Conquest of England by the Normans*, Vol. II. p. 321 *et seq.*

† Goodrich's *History of All Nations*, Vol. II. p. 954.

above the ears, and from wearing *coulins* (long locks) on their heads, or hair on their upper lips, and prescribing for them a particular kind of rude dress, so that they should not presume under heavy penalties to dress like the English.\* We refer especially to these laws, not that they were by any means the worst or most oppressive of their class, but because they indicate the principle on which England has always acted towards Ireland,—*divide et impera*. Nothing provoked the king more than to find that, much as the Anglo-Normans despised the Anglo-Saxons at home, they readily intermarried with the Irish, and assimilated themselves with them in every respect, often discarding their own names and adopting Irish names in their stead. His Majesty saw that it was of the first importance for his purposes, not only that no such friendly feeling should be cultivated between the English in Ireland and the native Irish, but that both should be made to hate each other as cordially as possible. Since the law prohibiting intermarriage and “fostering” was not sufficient for this, it became necessary to set a mark of degradation on the natives; hence the ukase in reference to the beard, hair, and clothing. How well these efforts succeeded in their object, is attested by different historians. After the Reformation it did not require so much effort to keep the indigenous and the English inhabitants of Ireland in mutual enmity. Sectarian animosity now proved a most useful auxiliary to British rule; for the hatred of race had already grown too feeble. Hitherto the English inhabitants of Ireland had been taught to hate the natives as an antagonistic, inferior race; now they were taught to hate them as believers in a false creed. The title “wild Irish” was not sufficiently repulsive, till reinforced by the still more obnoxious stigma attached to the term “Papist.” This was accordingly adopted; and among the first fruits of the Reformation for Ireland was a new set of penal laws against the Irish Papists. In reference to these laws Secretary Hutchinson wrote, in his *Account of Ireland*, in 1773:—

“The Papists incur penalties for foreign education, yet are not al-

---

\* Walker's *Historical Memoirs of Irish Bards*, p. 134.

lowed education at home ; they cannot be physicians, lawyers, soldiers. If they become traders and mechanics, they scarcely enjoy the rights of citizens. If farmers, they shall not improve, being discouraged by short limitation of tenure ; and *yet there is complaint of the dulness and laziness of a people whose spirit is restrained from exertion, and whose industry has no reward to excite it.*"

It was made a capital offence for the Irish to have schools or schoolmasters. If a schoolmaster was convicted of having taught, or attempted to teach, any Irish person, young or old, the punishment for the first offence was transportation ;\* and if he ever returned from penal servitude, and repeated the *crime*, the penalty was death. Yet the people thus treated were abused for not being intelligent and enlightened. Irish commerce was also placed under severe restrictions. Strafford wrote to his master, Charles I., in July, 1636, as follows : —

"I have discouraged the clothing trade of Ireland, and will discourage it, in regard it would trench not only on the clothing trade of England, so as if the Irish should manufacture their own wool, which grows in very great quantities, we (the English) should not only lose the profit we made now by indrapping their goods, but his Majesty lose extremely by his customs. And in conclusion it might be feared they might beat us out of the trade itself by underselling us, which they were able to do."

However willing Charles I. was to act upon these suggestions, he lost his head before he was able to do so. But what he had not been spared to begin was fully accomplished by Charles II. before Ireland had time to recover even partially from the ravages of Cromwell's war.† Charles II. procured the passage of three acts against Irish commerce ; — one prohibiting the exportation of Irish wool to England, another prohibiting the exportation thither of Irish cattle, and the third forbidding all Irish trade with the colonies ; and, after having added an act or two of his own, William III., of "glorious, pious, and immortal memory," had a fleet of war-vessels stationed on the coast of Ireland for the sole purpose

---

\* De Rebus Hibernicis, Vol. II. pp. 366 – 371. General Desgrigny, who accompanied Lauzun to Ireland in 1690, wrote to the French Minister of War as follows : "La politique des Anglois a été de tenir ces peuples cy come des esclaves, et si bas qu'il ne leur estoit permis d'apprendre à lire et à écrire."

† Macaulay's History of England, Vol. II. p. 38 *et seq.*

of seizing as pirates all Irish vessels found attempting to trade with any foreign nation.

None have been more earnest in their denunciations of this iniquitous, cruel system than Englishmen. From the time of Spenser and Raleigh to the present, some of England's greatest intellects have always been ready to plead the cause of Ireland against her oppressors. In short, no injustice has been inflicted upon her without a protest from the other side of the Channel. It has long been the fashion to speak of the so-called Act of Union, which deprived Ireland of her native legislature, as a measure to which the Irish themselves were a consenting party. It can easily be shown, from English testimony alone, how little truth there is in this statement. Thus, in 1800, Lord Grey spoke as follows, in the English Parliament, in a debate on the Union Bill : —

“ If the Parliament of Ireland had been left to itself, unintimidated, untempted, unawed, it would without hesitation have rejected the resolutions (Articles of Union). One hundred and twenty out of its three hundred members strenuously opposed this Union, having among them two thirds of the country members, and the representative of Dublin, and of nearly all the places which are to send members to the Imperial Parliament. The majority of one hundred and sixteen were placemen, several of them generals on the staff, without a foot of land in Ireland. All persons holding office under government, if *they hesitated to vote with the minister, were instantly dismissed*. Even this step was ineffectual, and other arts were resorted to which I *cannot name in this place*. . . . . Twenty-seven of the thirty-two counties of Ireland petitioned against the measure. Dublin and almost every other town in Ireland did the same, and despite every effort of government, the number of petitioners against, to that of petitioners in favor, was as seven hundred to one ! . . . . Could a nation in more direct terms express its disapprobation of a political measure, than Ireland has of this Legislative Union ? ”

With the exception of Lord Castlereagh, there was not a single man of any eminence who was connected with the Irish Parliament, or had taken any part in Irish politics, that did not oppose the Act of Union to the utmost of his ability. The noble efforts of Grattan and Curran, especially of the former, in defence of the Irish Parliament, are familiar to all

who are acquainted with British literature; and those of Bushe, Saurin, and Plunkett were scarcely less zealous and energetic.

"France," said Lord Plunkett, "in all the unrestrained excesses that anarchy and atheism have given birth to, has not committed a more insidious act *against her enemy* than is now attempted by the professed champion of civilized Europe against Ireland, — a friend and ally, even in the hour of her calamity and distress. At a moment when the country is filled with British troops, — whilst the *Habeas Corpus Act is suspended*, — while trials by court-martial are carrying on in all parts of the kingdom, — while the people are made to believe that they have no right to meet and deliberate, — at the moment when we are distracted by internal dissensions, — *dissensions kept alive as the pretext of our subjugation and the instrument of our future thralldom*, — such is the time in which the Union is proposed!"

But all was in vain. It was subsequently admitted by Lord Castlereagh that he had expended a million and a half sterling in bribery, in order to accomplish this job. Not content with betraying his country, and proving at all times its worst enemy, he availed himself of every means at his command to induce others to do the same. And the measure brought about by agencies like these is what has since been so pompously called the *Treaty* of Union between Great Britain and Ireland! — a treaty which we are told is irrevocable, — one which, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, altereth not.

Our readers are aware that this miscalled Union still exists, — that Ireland has had no legislature of her own since the year 1800. Does it require a Grey, a Grattan, or a Plunkett to prove that this is a just cause of complaint on the part of the Irish people? Does it require any argument to satisfy any intelligent mind that it is injurious to Ireland to depend on the British Parliament for her local laws? If no other injury had been entailed on her by the Union but the encouragement it has given to absenteeism, would not this be sufficient? Of course ten landlords and moneyed men now go to London to spend their money for one who did so while there was a Parliament in Dublin, not to mention the Irish members of the two Houses. Those who have property, so



far from residing permanently in Ireland, seldom visit it, but leave their tenants to the tender mercies of their agents; whose only care is to collect rents for their employers and make money for themselves. If, to this continual drain on the country by those who are induced to spend its money out of it, the revenue annually paid into the British exchequer is added,—a revenue of not less than \$ 36,000,000,—the total will give those who think that Ireland has no longer any just cause for complaint some faint idea of the extent of their error, and they will be able to appreciate the bitter truth of Prior's remarks in his "Inquiry into the Condition of Ireland," in 1729.

"We are at no loss to point out the sources of our misfortune;—no country labors under so wasteful a drain of its treasure as Ireland, without the least value returned. There is not in history an instance of any one country paying so large a yearly tribute to another."—p. 46.

We are told that Ireland is represented in the British Parliament, and can therefore control her own affairs. This is a mockery. How could one hundred and five members, even if united, control anything in a house composed of six hundred and fifty-eight? Still less can they do so when nearly, if not quite, half of them are placemen,—men who are ready to support the government in any measure it may propose, no matter how surely it may tend to injure the Irish people pecuniarily, or to circumscribe their liberties. Hence it is that on any pretext, however insignificant, the Habeas Corpus Act may be suspended in Ireland, as it so frequently is. The Union, indeed, cannot be regarded as the worst evil of which the Irish have had reason to complain. But would it not be sufficient by itself to account for the famine, when considered in connection with the impoverished condition of the people resulting from previous penal laws,—that condition which forced them to depend on the potato as almost their only food?

Whenever the story of Ireland has been truly told, whether in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, or nineteenth century, it is still the same,—still one of sorrow and suffering,—

always mournful, except, we are glad to add, at the present time. Indeed, so much alike are the accounts given at intervals of half a century, by tourists from different nations,—English, French, American, German,—of the wretched condition of the Irish, that one would almost think they had all visited the same scenes of desolation together. And the same gloomy similarity is to be found in descriptions by Irishmen, whether satirists, orators, historians, or poets. However much Swift, Grattan, Bushe, Burke, Goldsmith, and Moore differ in almost everything else, all concur as to Ireland's unparalleled wrongs and sorrows. So striking, indeed, is the resemblance between the pictures which they have drawn at different times, that to be familiar with one is almost to know all. Had not Dean Swift been deeply impressed with a sense of the oppression under which the Irish labored in his day, he would not, as he did, have risked his life, as well as his highest worldly prospects, in their defence by his famous *Drapier's Letters*. A more bitter satire on a government scarcely exists in any language than his "*Modest Proposal*," although some have pretended to take his proposition in regard to eating Irish infants in its literal sense, and have accordingly censured him for his "brutality," &c. Nor are they the less disposed to do so from the fact that he qualified his "*Proposal*" as follows:—

"I desire the reader will observe that I calculate my remedy for this one individual kingdom of Ireland; and for *no other that ever was, is, or I think ever can be on earth.*" — *Swift's Works*, Vol. IV. p. 305.

In his "*Short View of the State of Ireland*," written in 1727, Swift says:—

"The conveniency of ports and havens which nature hath bestowed so liberally on this kingdom, is of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon. . . . Ireland is the only kingdom I ever heard or read of, either in ancient or modern story, which was denied the liberty of exporting their native commodities and manufactures whenever they pleased, except to countries at war with their own prince or state; yet this privilege, by the superiority of mere power, is refused us in the most momentous parts of commerce; besides an Act of Navigation to which we never consented, pinned

down upon us, and rigorously executed, and a thousand other unexampled circumstances as grievous as they are invidious to mention. . . . Thus we are in the condition of patients who have physic sent them by doctors at a distance, strangers to their constitution and the nature of their disease; and thus we are forced to pay five hundred per cent to decide our properties; in all which we have likewise the honor to be distinguished from the whole race of mankind. . . . No strangers from other countries make this a part of their travels, where they can expect to see nothing but scenes of misery and desolation. . . . If we do flourish, it must be against every law of nature and reason, like the thorn at Glastonbury, which blossoms in the midst of winter." — *Swift's Works*, Vol. X. p. 305 *et seq.*

In a kindred vein of indignant invective is the following passage from Junius's celebrated Letter to the King:—

"The people of Ireland have been uniformly plundered and oppressed. In return they give you every day fresh marks of their resentment. They despise the miserable governor you have sent them, because he is the creature of Lord Bute; *nor is it from any natural confusion in their ideas that they are so ready to confound the original of a king with the disgraceful representation of him.*"

If we come down to our own times, the picture is essentially the same. Political changes there have been, it is true, — new acts of Parliament for the benefit (?) of Ireland, — new "concessions." But when we examine them, we find them hollow; or, if sometimes otherwise, they are either repealed, or counteracted by supplementary laws.

As for the disabilities under which the Roman Catholics labored until 1829, and which have not been entirely removed to the present day, they did not originate in any real hatred to Romanism, but simply in a desire to keep Protestants and Catholics divided, so that both could be the more easily trampled upon. It would be the height of credulity to think that the same Christian government which avowedly protected, if it did not openly encourage, Braminism and Buddhism, was influenced in its persecution of the Irish Catholics by mere conscientious scruples against Popery. This was placed in a clear light by Lord Byron, in April, 1812, when, in a speech in the House of Lords, on the Catholic Claims, he said:—

“It is singular, indeed, to observe the difference between our foreign and domestic policy; if Catholic Spain, faithful Portugal, or the no less Catholic and faithful king of the one Sicily (of which, by the by, you have lately deprived him), stand in need of succor, away goes a fleet and an army, an ambassador and a subsidy, sometimes to fight pretty hardly, generally to negotiate very badly, and always to pay very dearly, for our Popish allies. But let four millions of fellow-subjects pray for relief, who fight and pay and labor in your behalf, they must be treated as aliens, and although their ‘father’s house has many mansions,’ there is no resting-place for them. Allow me to ask, are you not fighting for the emancipation of Ferdinand the Seventh, who certainly is a fool, and consequently, in all probability, a bigot; and have you more regard for a foreign sovereign than your own fellow-subjects, who are not fools, for they know your interest better than you know your own,—who are not bigots, for they return you good for evil,—*but who are in worse durance than the prison of an usurper, inasmuch as the fetters of the mind are more galling than those of the body?*” — *Byron’s Works*, (New York, 1834,) p. 282.

We have not yet reached the famine; still the wail of Irish woe and misery is heard on every side. There is no traveller in the country,—except such as have been sent thither by government, for its own purposes, to tell, not what Ireland is, but what it ought to be with all its unsurpassed natural advantages,—who does not repeat, with little alteration, the sad tale of his predecessors. Kohl, the distinguished German traveller, who visited Ireland a short time before the late famine, and who devoted much attention to the condition and prospects of the people, relates his experience as follows:—

“A French author, Beaumont, who had seen the Irish peasant in his cabin and the North American Indian in his wigwam, has assured us that the savage is better provided for than the poor man in Ireland. Indeed, the question may be raised whether in the whole world a nation is to be found that is subjected to such physical privations as the peasantry in some parts of Ireland. This fact cannot be placed in too strong a light; for if it can once be shown that the wretchedness of the Irish population is without a parallel example on the globe, surely every friend of humanity will feel himself called on to reflect whether means may not be found for remedying an evil of so astounding a magnitude. . . . There are nations of slaves, but they have by long custom been made unconscious of the yoke of slavery. This is not the

case with the Irish, who have a strong feeling of liberty within them, and *are fully sensible of the weight of the yoke they have to bear.*"

What are the remedies which England has been in the habit of applying to this state of things? Of course there could be no real remedies, as long as the causes which produced it were still in operation. To attempt aught of the kind would be something like putting a hand into one's pocket to rob him of his money, and giving him at the same time advice how to get rich like other people, adding some expressions of pity after the victim was left penniless, or of astonishment that he should be in such needy circumstances in so fertile a country. The policy of sending commissioners, once in three or four years, to examine into the causes of Irish misery, has generally been nothing more honest than this. The commissioners would travel about Ireland in their carriages, make certain formal inquiries, return to London, present a report to their employers, get their pay, and this would generally be the last of their mission. The Devon Commission examined witnesses in all parts of Ireland two years prior to the late famine. The evidence thus collected was published in several large volumes. The Commission fully admitted that the condition of Ireland was wretched to the last degree, and made certain suggestions on the subject of amelioration. But this was all. As for good, it effected none worthy of the name; in the opinion of not a few, it did harm. Yet Ireland had to pay all the expense, as *she had to pay the money expended by Lord Castlereagh, in 1800, in bribing members of Parliament to betray her!* The members of the Devon Commission had scarcely pocketed their hire, when the people of Ireland began to die of starvation by hundreds. The writer of this paper, having been resident in the country during the whole progress of the famine, can bear testimony, that no language could describe, much less exaggerate, the heart-rending scenes to be witnessed almost daily throughout the island, in town and country, from the beginning to the end of that melancholy period. It is sickening to think of those scenes even now; and no one that beheld them can ever forget them. Suffice it to say, that at least a million and a half of the people died of hunger and its concomitants, in the years

1846 – 1848. The Census Commissioners say in their Report, that, had the population of Ireland increased up to 1851 in the same proportion as that of England and Wales, it would have numbered in that year 9,018,799; whereas the actual population amounted only to 6,552,385, — exhibiting a deficit of two millions and a half.

Much has been said about the generosity evinced by the British government in its efforts to relieve the starving Irish; but when we come to examine the facts, we readily see with how little reason. We find that America, which was three thousand miles distant from the sufferers, was much more prompt and cordial in affording them relief. In the middle of 1846 the loss sustained by Ireland in the destruction of the potato was estimated at no less a sum than £16,000,000; and to make up for this loss and help to save the people from extinction, the British Parliament was induced, with considerable difficulty, to give about a million and a half. The loss sustained the next year was three times as great, and the increase in the ratio of deaths by starvation was still greater; but the Imperial Parliament thought itself quite liberal when, after much hesitation and discussion, it voted eight millions, — little more than the sum wrung from Ireland in one year, in the shape of revenue alone.\* The total sum advanced for the purpose of Irish relief during the whole famine, including what was expended for public works, did not exceed, according to the official reports, which were not likely to omit any

---

\* The salary of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is £ 20,000. Until recently the salary of the Chief Secretary for Ireland was £ 5,000; it is now £ 3,000. The salary of the Under Secretary is £ 2,000; that of the Lord Chancellor, £ 8,000.

Thus the Lord Lieutenant of the poorest country in Christendom has four times as large a salary as the President of the United States! Seeing that "His Excellency's" office is a mere sinecure, one would think that he might have dispensed with half the sum during the famine, but he drew every penny as usual; and we doubt whether he contributed as much for the relief of the starving Irish as the Sultan of Turkey, who generously gave \$ 5,000 out of his private purse. When Count Lauzun went to Ireland, in 1690, as general of the small French army sent by Louis XIV. to aid James II. against William III., James offered to pay him in French gold the same salary that the Lord Lieutenant had then, £10,000 a year, as commander-in-chief of the Irish army; but he generously refused to fill his coffers with the money extorted from so wretched a people. See Macaulay's *History of England*, Vol. II. p. 156.

important item in the account, £10,700,000, — less than two years' Irish revenue; and nearly three millions of this have already been repaid. Such was the munificence of the British government to Ireland when its assistance was most needed. It was otherwise, indeed, with the British people, as will be seen from the following statement, which we copy from the "Census Report," premising that we are sure the United States sent much more money than is here accounted for.

"When the potato failure of autumn, 1846, became known, the Society of Friends, in London, opened a subscription; and the British Association for the Relief of Extreme Distress in Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland was formed on the 6th of January, 1847. A 'queen's letter' was issued with the same object, and the 24th of March was appointed by proclamation for religious observances, 'in behalf of ourselves and our brethren who, in many parts of the United Kingdom, are suffering extreme famine and sickness.' . . . . The remotest stations in India, the most recent settlements in Canada, contributed, and £625 was subscribed by British residents in Mexico. The sum collected under the queen's letter was £171,533; by the British Association, £263,251. Five sixths of these sums were sent to Ireland, the other one sixth to the Highlands of Scotland. The National Club in London collected £17,930. The General Relief Committee for all Ireland collected (in Ireland) upwards of £50,000, independent of £10,000 in cash, and an equal value in food sent them from the sum raised by the queen's letter.

British North America sent . . . . .	£ 12,463
United States . . . . .	5,852
British India . . . . .	5,674
Cape of Good Hope . . . . .	2,900
Australia . . . . .	2,282
Ireland herself (independent of local subscriptions) . . .	9,888
The Society of Friends . . . . .	168,000

of which £108,651 was spent on food, and £5,000 to  
£10,000 was the value of clothes sent from America and  
England.

The 'Ladies' Relief Association for Ireland' raised . . .	11,465
South America, £772; the Military, £386 . . . . .	1,158
Scotland, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Gibraltar, the Channel, West Indian, and Ionian Islands . . . . .	2,168
Irish Relief Association, including £17,782 from England; £152 from Ireland; France £1,390; Italy £2,708;	

British America £2,821; United States £847; India  
£5,947; West Indies £1,043; Australia £2,314; and  
£508 from Military, Pensioners, and Constabulary 42,000”  
*Census Report*, Vol. V. pp. 286–288.

The little that Ireland received from the British government arrived tardily, and a large proportion of it went into the pockets of government *employés*. The whole amount, however, which was raised by Parliamentary enactments, and by private subscriptions at home and abroad, as indicated by the above statement, was very considerable; but so universal was the suffering among the humbler classes — there being nearly, if not quite, three millions of people in a state of utter destitution in July, 1847 — that it seemed a mere pittance. The miserable cottiers and day-laborers were the first victims. Private benevolence certainly did its best to save them, — that was all they had to depend on for nearly six months; but the benevolent themselves, few of whom had ever been rich, were impoverished in the mean time, so that, before the government relief came, incredible numbers had perished. The small farmers made every possible effort to remain independent, selling everything that could be sold, even to their very beds and clothes, in order to procure a scanty allowance of food — just sufficient to sustain nature — for themselves and their families. But these efforts could last but for a time. As for work, there was none to be had; so that when every article for which a loaf of bread could be procured was gone, including the little trinkets which their women had worn in their better days, they had only to sit down and die; for they had already become walking spectres, with their bones protruding through the skin. Often whole families died in this manner; first the parents, who would give the last morsel to their children rather than eat it themselves; then the eldest of the children, who would pursue the same self-denying course toward their younger and hitherto more feeble brothers and sisters. Sometimes father, mother, and children were found dead together in one another's arms on a little straw, their only bed, with their cabin door closed, and their bodies in different stages of decomposition. Many died in this manner rather than make it known to their neighbors that



they were hungry ; others sank on the road-side while on their way to some relief depot to seek a single meal for their children, or while collecting wild herbs in the fields for the same purpose ; and it was no uncommon thing to see the infant child still clinging to the breast of a lifeless mother.

But the picture is too painful to dwell upon. In spite of this unheard-of suffering, some still pretend to wonder that the population should have been diminished to the extent of two and a half millions, whereas the real wonder would be if the diminution had not been immense. But no writer in the interest of the British government will tell us that, while the people were thus starving, and running away from their native land, as if from an enemy that gave no quarter, there was abundance of food in the country ; plenty of wheat and oats, flour and meal, beef and mutton, the products of its own soil. But these were for the rich, not for the poor, whose sole resource was the potato, which being now blighted, there was nothing left for them but charity or death.\*

Having thus taken a rapid glance at the past of Ireland, omitting not a few real grievances so as to leave some reasonable space for the consideration of her present, we now proceed to examine the grounds on which it is stated that the country has become prosperous since the famine, and that the people have no longer any just reason to complain. Here also we must necessarily be brief. We may remark, in passing, that none who are familiar with the incontrovertible facts already given will blame the Irish peasantry, — those from whom our own Irish immigrant population is chiefly recruited, — however great their faults, for being what they are. Ought we not rather to remember the blighting, demoralizing influences to which they have been subjected on their native soil from time immemorial, — such influences — to the shame of British civilization be it told — as those of hunger and ignorance, the two prime brutalizers of the human race ? Could the Irish peasant, in his rags, without any food save the worst, and with little even of that, and without the means of earning it, philosophize like some of our modern

---

\* The ships bearing charity to Ireland were sure to be met by other ships carrying away large cargoes of flour and meal.

philanthropists, well might he reply to those who reproach him with laziness and want of resolution, —

“ Wait till, like me, your hopes are blighted, — till  
Sorrow and shame are handmaids of your *cabin*,  
Famine and poverty your guests at table,  
Despair your bedfellow, — then rise, but not  
From sleep, and judge ! ”

The Irish workingman is certainly not lazy, as all who have observed him in his native land will bear willing testimony. No other man will work so cheap, or so long, or so hard, rather than be idle, or in order to procure food for his family. To an American it might seem incredible, but it is literally true, that many an Irishman has worked almost the whole year for sixpence a day, living on his own food, his wife or daughter taking to him his frugal repast over a distance of perhaps two or three miles; and even this sixpence he would not get in cash, but would only be credited for it in his rent. Right glad he would be, however, to have the privilege of earning it. Before the appointed hour for going to work in the morning, during the long days of summer, he would devote an hour or two to his own little plot of perhaps half an acre of ground; in the evening, on his return, he would work for an hour or two more. Then in the autumn he would cross the Channel to England as a deck passenger, earn what he could there at gathering in the harvest, living on the coarsest food, and generally sleeping in the field, or barn, at night; then hasten home to his expectant wife and children with whatever little money he was able to save, often not more than a few shillings, to work again as cheerfully as ever for sixpence a day.\*

---

\* We do not mean, by anything we have said on this subject, to justify the conduct of which the lower order of the Irish in this country are too frequently guilty, — their intemperance, their bloody conflicts with one another, and the too active, overbearing part, not to call it by a worse name, which they take in our elections. These are grave faults; and it is not at all strange that they excite prejudices against them among those who do not understand their history. Owing to the restrictions on Irish commerce which rendered wheat, barley, and oats almost drugs in the market, while the heavy English tax on whiskey caused the latter to be very dear, illicit distillation early became prevalent; and the illicit article being sold cheap, it is not difficult to understand how easy it was for a people so sociable as the Irish, and always smarting under wrongs, to become addicted to its use. The

But this was before the famine. Now, the case is altered. The laborer's daily wages now are three or four times as large as formerly. But why? Because competition in the labor market is not one fourth as great as before the famine; in other words, because three fourths of the laborers died of hunger, or left the country to seek a home elsewhere. Yet the increase of wages is one of the principal facts now adduced as proof that Ireland is prosperous at last! According to this principle, would it not have been a good and righteous proceeding to have brought out all the artillery in the kingdom in the early part of 1846, before the famine commenced, and to have mowed down about a million and a half of the people with grape-shot, causing as many more to seek safety in flight? We are told that, if there is a decrease in the Irish population, there is an increase in Irish cattle, sheep, and other live stock; as if the sheep and cows of a nation, and not the well-being and well-doing of its people, constituted its wealth. This theory is not new, however, with the British government in its treatment of Ireland. It is as old as the time of Swift, who more than a century ago wrote as follows:—

---

cause of the faction fights on our railroads is to be traced to the efforts of the British government to keep different portions of the people divided against each other. Hence the signification of "Fardowners" and "Corkonians." It is the hatred thus caused that Moore so feelingly regrets in one of his Irish melodies, that on the *Battle of the Boyne*.

"Alas for her who sits and mourns,  
*E'en now*, beside that river!  
 Unwearied still the Fiend returns,  
 And stored is still his quiver.  
 'When will this end, ye Powers of Good?'  
 She weeping asks for ever;  
 But only hears, from out that flood,  
 The Demon answer, 'Never!'"

Nor is it more difficult to find at least extenuating circumstances for their violent and often lawless conduct at our elections. In the first place, it is a novelty to them to have the privilege of voting. When they have it, they think they ought to exercise it to the fullest extent, as if to make amends for the disabilities under which they had labored at home. Our demagogues avail themselves of these weaknesses for their own purposes, and do their best to perpetuate them. Add to this the fact that our Irish immigrant population belong in general to that class of their countrymen who had not the means of obtaining even the rudiments of education, and it will be admitted that, upon the whole, the poor Irish are no worse than almost any other people would have been under similar influences.

"The good of it is [having a profusion of sheep and cattle], that the more sheep we have, *the fewer human creatures are left to wear the wool or eat the flesh*. Ajax was mad when he mistook a flock of sheep for his enemies ; but we shall never be sober until we have the same way of thinking." — *Swift's Works*, Vol. X. p. 320.

Much stress is laid by government commissioners on the diminished number of small farms, and the corresponding increase of large grazing farms. The meaning of this is, that the poor cottiers have been put out of the way by oppression and famine, to make room for those who will raise cattle for the English market, and may at the same time add to their own importance without the fear of being annoyed by the dispossessed occupants. It is, however, but the old way of doing "justice to Ireland," — the same heartless policy so eloquently denounced by Goldsmith.

"Yet count our gains. This *wealth is but a name*  
That leaves our useful products still the same.  
*Not so the loss.* The man of wealth and pride  
Takes up a space that *many poor supplied* ;  
Space for his lake, his park's extended bounds,  
Space for his horses, equipage, and hounds ;

While, scourged by famine from the smiling land,  
The mournful peasant leads his humble band ;  
*And while he sinks, without one arm to save,*  
The country blooms — a garden and a grave."

This is, doubtless, the sort of improvement to which the Census Commissioners allude, when, in closing their voluminous Report, they use the following language :—

"In conclusion, we feel it will be *gratifying* to your Excellency to find that, although the population has been diminished *in so remarkable a manner by famine, disease, and emigration*, and has been *since decreasing*, the results of the Irish census are on the whole SATISFACTORY." (!)

In recapitulating, in another part of their Report, the numerous causes which combined to produce the excellent "results" that are now rendering Ireland so happy, the same gentlemen inform her Majesty and her Parliament that "*no doubt the diminution of the people had also its effect*" ! There is no man in Ireland who has exerted himself more for the last quarter

of a century, in and out of Parliament, as the champion of tenant right, and as the friend of the people generally, than Mr. Sharman Crawford; and it may be added, that there are few, if any, who understand the interests of Ireland so well. His views on this new source of Irish prosperity may be learned by an extract which we subjoin from a letter of his, published in the Dublin Freeman's Journal, October 15, 1856, in reply to the statements of the Census Commissioners:—

“But I can never feel assured of national improvement till I see it accompanied with some evidence of revival of Ireland's exhausted population. . . . . In place of this, I fear the *exterminating and consolidating* system is largely *operating*. It is the fashionable doctrine to call this improvement; but the extermination of human beings, and *the substitution of brute animals for the human race*, on the soil of Ireland, is not an improvement grateful to my mind. . . . . I confess I have an apprehension of the undue extension of the grazing system, *which in Ireland can only coexist with a reduced or exterminated population, thus impairing the national resources for every purpose which requires the application of human power.*”

We might fill whole pages with the opinions of Englishmen to the same effect; but the fact is self-evident, and one which it requires little skill in political economy to understand perfectly. Real good has been done to Ireland, however, since the famine; and far from ignoring this, or refusing to give credit where credit is due, we are glad to place the fact in bold relief. The good we refer to is not a result of the Irish Poor Laws, the distorted History of which forms a portion of the text of our article, and of which we shall presently have a word to say, but of what is called the Irish Encumbered Estates Act. The main object of this measure was to enable landlords to dispose of their mortgaged estates, without having recourse to the tardy, expensive, and vexatious process of the Court of Chancery; and to enable creditors to recover what was due to them, or as much of it as possible, without incurring the enormous charges without which there was no hope under the old system. The estates of large numbers of extensive proprietors used to remain mortgaged, often from generation to generation, doing comparatively little good

either to debtor or to creditor. Of course such a state of things entailed much injury on the people generally ; combining powerfully, as it did, with the other various evils against which the country had to contend, to retard improvement, to cause industry to languish, and to bring about a general bankruptcy. The Encumbered Estates Act, by instituting a new court in Dublin called the Court of Claims, which has the power of selling the encumbered property promptly to the highest bidders, with little expense to the proprietors or mortgagees, has afforded an easy and excellent remedy for at least one evil which had long been felt in Ireland. From the statistics of the new court recently published, we learn that from the 25th of October, 1849, to the 25th of May, 1857, 4,109 petitions for the sale, partition, and exchange of land had been presented to the commissioners. Of these, 1,195 originated with the embarrassed owners, and 2,914 with the creditors. On the whole, 3,197 orders for sale were given, and the property was promptly sold in 11,123 lots to 7,216 purchasers, of whom 6,902 were Irish, the remainder English, Scotch, and foreigners. The estates already sold have brought £ 20,194,201, of which amount, immense when we consider the poverty of the country, £18,000,000 has been distributed to the parties interested. Even from this brief summary of the results, so far as yet known, of the operation of the Encumbered Estates Act, it is evident that it has proved a benefit to the country. But will its beneficial influence be permanent? or is it sufficient to render the country prosperous under its present circumstances? With whatever hesitation and doubt the former question may be answered, our reply to the latter is a decided negative. The act is good enough in itself; but there are too many bad acts, and too many deep-rooted evils, to counteract its effects. It does not prevent Ireland from being drawn after the chariot-wheels of England as usual; it does not exempt the people from having to pay out of their poverty an enormous sum annually into the British treasury, for which they receive nothing in return; it does not relieve them from the incubus of a State Church, which all the world condemns as a cruel imposition;—in a word, it does not in any way interfere with the so-called “*Treaty* of

Union," which leaves Ireland at the mercy of the English Parliament.

But the "remedial measures" which England regards as casting all others in the shade, scarcely excepting the Encumbered Estates Act, are the Irish Poor Laws. These laws were to put an end, at once and for ever, to death by starvation in Ireland, and to produce various other excellent results too numerous to mention. But what are the facts? As a portion of the answer to this question, we quote an extract from the general remarks of the Census Commissioners in their Report, with reference to the main causes of the diminution of the population:—

"In the Irish returns made in 1841, *only 117 deaths were registered from starvation for the ten years prior to that period; but from thence, according to the registration made in 1851, deaths from this cause began notably to increase, from 187 in 1842, to 516 in 1845. After that period deaths attributed to starvation increased rapidly, so as to amount to 2,041 for the year 1846; in 1847 they reached the great height of 6,058, and in the following years, 1848 and 1849, taken together, they amounted to 9,395. In 1850 there were even more than in 1846; and during the first quarter of 1851 as many as 652 deaths attributed to starvation were recorded. The total deaths returned to us under the head of starvation amounted to 21,770, the sexes being in the proportion of 706 females to 100 males.*" — *The Census of Ireland for 1851, General Report, Part VI.*

In order to understand this, it is only necessary to bear in mind, that 1842 was the first year of the operation of the Poor Laws in Ireland. Thus it is admitted, that for the ten years preceding the introduction of the Poor Laws (1842) the total number of deaths from starvation was only one hundred and seventeen,—less than twelve a year on an average; but during the first year of the operation of those laws one hundred and eighty-seven died of starvation; and "from thence," to use the Commissioners' own words, "deaths from this cause began notably to increase." What a melancholy commentary on the sort of *benefits* rendered to Ireland by the *sister* kingdom! And no one, surely, will accuse the Commissioners of having represented the case as worse than it was. The Poor Laws, indeed, involve a large ex-

penditure.\* But it is the expenditure of Irish money,—money raised by heavy taxes on the people. Before the introduction of the Poor Laws, mendicancy had to depend on voluntary alms, and the amount annually contributed in this manner was estimated at from £700,000 to £800,000. This was given cheerfully, and there was no expense incurred in its distribution. But the building of workhouses alone, under the government system, cost £1,420,780. These houses are to be seen now in all parts of the country; and they are much more like fortresses or prisons, than asylums for the relief of the destitute. Those who have seen these gloomy piles, with their numerous cells and small, grated windows, their strong iron gates, their rules and regulations, which may not inaptly be called a “penal code,” and the miserable rations doled out to their inmates, can hardly be surprised that nothing short of absolute hunger itself will induce the poor to enter them. Hence it is that the beggars have been as numerous as ever since they were built. The people give alms as before; their burden in this way has been lightened but little if any; and they have to pay the Poor Law tax beside. The truth is, in brief, that a very large proportion, if not the greater part, of the money thus levied, goes into the pockets of the well-paid officials of government, from the wealthy Poor Law Commissioners downward. Thus, prior to 1842, the beggars alone had to be sustained; now, a whole army of commissioners, superintendents, guardians, clerks, and functionaries of every name, are to be sustained with them,—a circumstance which, in our mind, sufficiently explains why it is that deaths from starvation, far from diminishing, “notably increased,” after the Poor Laws came into operation.

Such are the “remedial measures” upon which, according to the organs of the British government, Ireland is to flourish in future, in spite of all the heavy burdens she has to bear. True, they have cost England nothing. If she advanced money for building the workhouses, she was to be repaid with interest. The measures by which she would lose, which would lessen her revenue, or make the landlords disaffected,

---

\* Even in 1851, three years after the famine, the amount was £1,166,954, nearly \$6,000,000. British Almanac, 1854.



she takes good care not to grant. For a whole century the Irish people have been petitioning, almost incessantly, for tenant right, that is, the simple and natural right on the part of the tenant to some compensation from his landlord, on the expiration of his lease, for improvements made on his farm, in case of his ejectment, his voluntary removal, or an increase of rent on account of these very improvements. What injustice can be greater, than to charge a tenant for improvements which he has made himself, or what can discourage a tenant more? There can be no alternative opinion as to this. Even the government commissioners themselves have recognized the evil, and have recommended the granting of tenant right. In the Report of the Devon Commission, published in 1847, the subject is referred to as follows :—

“The importance and absolute necessity of *securing* to the occupier some distinct mode of remuneration is obvious. . . . The master evil, poverty, proceeds from the fact of occupiers withholding the investment of capital and labor from the ample and profitable field for it that lies within their reach, this withholding being attributable to *a reasonable disinclination to invest labor or capital on the property of others, without security for remuneration for the investment.*” — p. 155 *et seq.*

It is now ten years since this recommendation was made to the British government by its own commissioners. In the mean time the subject has occupied the attention of all friends of Ireland in the British Islands; large meetings have been held at short intervals in all parts of the country; and hundreds of petitions have been presented to the Imperial Parliament earnestly praying for the required remedy. But all in vain. It might be dangerous to the loyalty of the Irish landlords to prevent them from oppressing their tenantry, — from robbing them of the fruits of their labor. Yet if the landlord were compelled by law to allow his tenant a fair remuneration for all improvements made on his farm, or precluded from ejecting him from his holding when a higher rent than he paid was offered for it, at the expiration of the lease, a prime source of distrust on one side, and jealousy, if not hatred, on the other, between the upper and lower classes, would be removed.

There are still greater objections to any effectual legislation against absenteeism. In the first place, if landlords were induced to remain at home to encourage their tenants, there would, as in the case just mentioned, be danger that the two classes would grow too familiar, — in fact, become attached to each other; and then, too, the large amount of Irish money now spent in England by absentee landlords would be spent in Ireland, — a result which those who have the power would much rather obstruct than further, however strong their protestations to the contrary.

But the grossest injustice of all is the State Church. Some excuse may be found on the part of England for every other grievance under which Ireland labors at the present; but for this there is none. The best and most conscientious friends of religion throughout Christendom are well known to be opposed to any connection between the State and the Church under any circumstances, convinced that the latter should be independent of the former, and left to the voluntary support of the people, as in the United States. There is some reason, however, in endowing a Church which is that of the majority of the people, as in England and Scotland. But in Ireland the case is the reverse of this. Here five sixths of the people are Catholics, while the Episcopal Protestants form but a mere fraction, scarcely numbering 600,000. This small minority possess the chief wealth of the country; while the poverty of the large majority is proverbial. Yet the latter have to maintain the Church of the former in splendor, and to support their own at the same time. If the State Church were at all likely to convert the Catholics to Protestantism, those who enforce its support might pretend that "the end justifies the means." But there is not the least hope of any such result. This is universally acknowledged. Nay, it is well known that its effect has always been the reverse; that its tendency has ever been, not only to excite the prejudices of the people against the Church itself, but also against all who belong to it. Nor is this strange; for in the minds of the people it is associated only with tithes, tithe-proctors, sheriffs, bailiffs, military, police, riot, and bloodshed. This seems strong language to apply to the influence of a Christian

Church ; but it is far too feeble to give any adequate idea of the reality. True, it does not now cause so much bloodshed as formerly. The well-paid rector does not now seize upon the poor man's pot, or upon the widow's bed, for his tithes. He has not to call on the military to enforce his "dues" at the bayonet's point. The scenes thus caused were a scandal to the civilized world ; so that a change was imperatively needed in order to approximate, if only in appearance, to the spirit of the age. The change consisted in enabling the landlord to add the tithes, or "tithe-rent charge," to his own rent ; thus causing the odious tax to be paid to him, instead of paying it in the first instance to the rector, or his proctor, as formerly. For the sake of public decency, it was well to make this arrangement ; but now, as before, the poor have to pay for the religious instruction of the rich ; or rather, they have to maintain what is little better than an immense bribery-fund, to enable the British government to reward its supporters with rich sinecures. In order to satisfy our readers that our remarks, harsh as they seem, do no injustice to the Established Church in Ireland, we now proceed to adduce authorities to sustain them, and in doing so we shall confine ourselves exclusively to the testimony of Protestants, — generally members of the same Church, — English and Scotch as well as Irish.

The late Mr. Hume described the Establishment, in one of his Parliamentary speeches in favor of its abolition, as "the blood-besmeared Church of 'Rathcormack'"; Mr. Roebuck characterized it in the same place as "the greatest ecclesiastical enormity in Europe"; and Mr. (now Baron) Macaulay, as "the most *utterly absurd and indefensible of all the institutions now existing in the civilized world.*" From a work recently published in England, called "The Black Book," on the English aristocratic system, a work quoted by Goodrich in his History of all Nations, we subjoin one or two extracts on the same subject.

"From another Parliamentary return, it is proved, as stated in the House of Commons by Captain Osborne, that eleven Irish state bishops left behind them amassed wealth to the amount of nine million three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars, accumulated within a period

of from forty to fifty years! The following is the list extracted from the Parliamentary return:—

*“ Probates of Wills of Irish Bishops.*

Stopford, Bishop of Cork . . . . .	\$ 125,000
Percy, Bishop of Dromore . . . . .	200,000
Cleaver, Bishop of Ferns . . . . .	250,000
Bernard, Bishop of Limerick . . . . .	300,000
Knox, Bishop of Killaloe . . . . .	500,000
Fowler, Bishop of Dublin . . . . .	750,000
Beresford, Bishop of Tuam . . . . .	1,250,000
Hawkins, Bishop of Raphoe . . . . .	1,250,000
Stuart, Bishop of Armagh . . . . .	1,500,000
Porter, Bishop of Clogher . . . . .	1,250,000
Agar, Bishop of Cashel . . . . .	2,000,000
<hr/>	
Making a total of . . . . .	\$ 9,375,000

“How great, indeed, must have been the privations of the Apostolic Bishop of Cashel, through which he could have saved two million dollars, in a single life, from the tribute levied on the poorest, worst fed, and worst clad of all the nations on the face of the earth! How much charity and Christian virtue must the prelates of Dublin, Tuam, Armagh, and Clogher have exercised, to enable them to hoard up fortunes of from \$700,000 to \$1,500,000 apiece! And these are the bishops of the Church of Ireland for which we are now keeping up an army in that country of thirty-four thousand soldiers, besides an army of police to mount guard over its safety. . . . .

“It will be observed, that the amount of hard cash divided by the Irish bishops amounts to \$755,638 annually; but this represents only a small portion of their actual gains! For there must also be added the rents and profits from six hundred and seventy thousand acres of land. . . . .

“And next, as to the work done by the parsons. Of the 2,384 parishes, 155 have no church, and not a single Protestant inhabitant; and 895 parishes have under fifty Protestant Episcopalians inhabiting them, including men, women, and children. They are not on that account, however, relieved from their payments to the Church, which are still compulsorily enacted. Of 1,385 benefices, there are 233 with under fifty Protestants in each. Of the 300 dignities and prebends, seventy-five have no duties whatever to perform; and eighty-six others are mere sinecures. The Dean of Raphoe receives \$7,455, the Precentor of Lismore \$2,240, the Archdeacon of Meath \$3,655, without any du-

ties whatever to perform, there being no Protestant souls to 'cure.' " — Vol. II. pp. 996, 997.

Such is a portion of the picture drawn in 1843, three years before the famine, by an Englishman and a Protestant, of the State Church in Ireland, — a picture the dark and repulsive features of which are not in the least exaggerated. Passing over a period of twelve years, we now come to see what were the opinions entertained regarding the same Church one year ago; and which, with too much reason, are entertained at the present day.

On the 27th of May, 1856, Mr. Edward Miall, the representative of Rochdale, England, delivered a speech in the House of Commons in favor of the impartial disendowment of all sects in Ireland. From this speech we make a brief extract. After some preliminary remarks in reference to the pretended contentment and prosperity of the Irish, Mr. Miall says : —

" Why, sir, the man who walks among explosive materials with a naked candle in his hand, has as good a right to reckon on complete security, as we have to calculate upon permanent tranquillity in Ireland *under our present ecclesiastical policy*. It is true that, of late, unusual care on the part of the executive, whether Whig or Conservative, coupled with *an unprecedented combination of peculiar circumstances affecting the social condition of Ireland*, has produced an unwonted calm. But it would be but poor statesmanship to mistake a temporary lull of agitation for settled popular contentment. . . . .

" The problem which your policy attempted to solve was, how to transfer from Roman Catholic to Protestant hands the ownership of the soil in Ireland, together with all political influence, all social distinctions, all the ordinary powers of achieving gain, all the potentialities of civilization, comfort, and affluence. The agencies chiefly relied upon in solving this problem were arbitrary laws, *wholesale confiscation, cold steel, and gunpowder*. And what are the staple materials which make up the history of that period? *Robbery* by the civil power, and retaliation by the outraged people, — *tyranny without limit, followed by insurrections without pity*, — *desperate sieges and hideous massacres*, — *a country laid waste*, — *a population alternating between the extremes of rage and terror*, — *a priesthood hunted up like noxious vermin*, — *a whole race crushed beneath a heavier doom than slavery*. Sir, seldom indeed has a bloodier drama been acted upon God's earth. You

cannot read it even at this time without feeling your blood curdle in your veins. . . . .

"Let us see what were the tender mercies of that policy to Catholics. They may be read in the Irish statute-book from 1690 to 1790. Well, look first at the disadvantageous position in which Irish Roman Catholics were placed by law as respects the offices and ministration of their own Church. Their higher ecclesiastics were sentenced to perpetual exile, and large rewards offered for their discovery within the kingdom. Their parochial priests were compelled to register themselves as a kind of ticket-of-leave functionaries, to give heavy bail that they would not go beyond the limits of their respective counties, and to engage that they would never exercise their functions out of their own parishes. They were forbidden to assume any ecclesiastical title, and to wear any professional dress, — to erect any steeple, to toll any bell, or officiate in any graveyard. . . . . How were the Roman Catholics treated in regard to education? Every Catholic school was closed, every *Catholic schoolmaster subject to transportation for life, with the penalty of death in case of his return. . . . .* No child of Catholic parents could be sent abroad for education without a special license; and lest the act should be evaded, any magistrate might, at any moment, demand that the child should be produced. . . . . State necessity may be pleaded in excuse of the original perpetration of this political crime (the Irish Law Church), but it cannot be accepted as a justification of it. Nor can it be said, as it may of some crimes, that time has transmuted its results into a blessing. The original vice remains. The great bulk of the people of Ireland, — the peasantry, the poor, — for whom, if for any, a Church Establishment should be maintained, — are not even, after the lapse of three centuries, benefited by the spiritual teaching and offices of your Establishment. It is still maintained for the Saxon rather than the Celt, for the gentry rather than the humbler classes, for the well-to-do minority rather than the helpless majority. Such a system as this is at once the offspring of tyranny and the badge of conquest. *Nothing on earth can justify it. We may disguise it as we will, but in the eyes of man and of God it is not the less a crime.*"

This gives a fair idea of the Irish Established Church as it is at the present day. Yet we are gravely told, that the Irish have no longer any reason to complain. But we have still a word to say, parenthetically, in reference to the manner in which the revenues of this pampered Establishment are expended. The work done by the clergy is but little, consider-

ing the number that are *supposed* to do it; but it is a heavy burden on the few who really do it, — not on those who enjoy the fat benefices, but on their miserable curates. While the rector, who has two, three, or four parishes, is squandering his money in England, or on the Continent, attending levees at Dublin Castle when he happens to be in Ireland, or dining and carousing with the military officers of the nearest garrison, his curate is obliged to preach every Sunday in perhaps two parishes; at least once a month to visit his Protestant parishioners, who, though few, are generally far asunder; sometimes to visit Roman Catholics with the view of converting them; to keep a horse, and a servant to attend him; to support, it may be, a large family, and dress like a gentleman, — all for seventy-five pounds a year. We know how incredible this may well seem; but it is too true. Is it any wonder, then, that the curates of the Establishment are proverbially poor, often in a state bordering on destitution? And if they happen to be ill, they have, out of their wretched pittance, to pay for a substitute. The London Times of September 8, 1856, contained a leading article in reference to this state of things, from which we quote a brief extract, in order to convince our readers that we do not at all exaggerate the privations under which the curates labor, or the heartless cruelty of those who receive the profits of their labors.

“That such a position, and *a bearing in harmony with it*, are only too general, there is abundant evidence. We have lately an instance in the demeanor of an English incumbent in Ireland to his unfortunate curate, doing the duty of a large parish for £80 a year and a few surplice-fees. No sooner was the unfortunate gentleman laid up with an illness arising from the insalubrity of his parish, than he received a virtual dismissal. The cost for supplying the poor man’s place was, of course, to be deducted from his pittance, and would inevitably soon eat it up. The generosity of the public has interposed between this curate and his employer, but the pecuniary figures of the case, the certain consequences of illness, and the summary nature of the ejection, are common to thousands of cases. Such are the scanty pittance, the precarious tenure, the impending calamities, and the social position of several thousand men, who are humorously told to bask in the splendors of a wealthy Establishment, and to rejoice in the light of golden canons and episcopal millionnaires.”

The truth is, that the great majority of those who pocket the revenues of the Irish Church are clergymen only in name. They are generally the younger sons of the nobility, for whom ordination is obtained to qualify them for rich sinecures. Sometimes the nobility have the benefices in their own hands, — own them as they own any other sort of property ; so that, if they have not younger sons who need them, they sell them to the highest bidder, like any other commodity of commerce. As for the bishops, they do little more than write their pastoral letters, (or get some curate to write them, which is frequently the case,) and sign receipts for their enormous salaries. Let us see, in passing, what these salaries are. The net revenues of the two archbishops and ten bishops, as given in a return presented to the House of Lords, in 1854, which is quoted in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article *Ireland*, are as follows : — Archbishop of Armagh, £14,664 9s. 2d. ; Archbishop of Dublin, £7,636 18s. 3d. ; Bishop of Meath, £3,764 1s. 1½d. ; Bishop of Derry, £8,061 3s. 8½d. ; Bishop of Down, £3,658 17s. 5¼d. ; Bishop of Kilmore, £6,607 12s. 3d. ; Bishop of Tuam, £3,898 7s. 7½d. ; Bishop of Ossory, £3,874 16s. 1¾d. ; Bishop of Cashel, £4,691 11s. 6½d. ; Bishop of Cork, £2,310 11s. 7½d. ; Bishop of Killaloe, £3,310 15s. 6¼d. ; Bishop of Limerick, £3,987 17s. 1¾d. ; making a total for the archbishops and bishops alone, for one year, of £66,437 1s. 6½d., — nearly one third of a million of dollars.

Is it strange that the apostolic men who are the recipients of these princely annuities should, when so disposed, hoard up millions for their posterity ? But what might seem strange is, that they do not evince the least inclination to forward the interests of the unfortunate people who have to pay this money ; but that, on the contrary, they are found, almost invariably, arrayed, both in and out of Parliament, against every liberal measure designed to benefit Ireland. As members of the House of Lords, — “spiritual peers,” — the Irish, on whose poverty they prey like vultures, find them their most uncompromising enemies. They oppose even the trifling grants made in recent years for the education of the masses, desiring to have all under their own control, their pretext for this being that the non-sectarian schools are ex-



posed to Popish influences; and, as a matter of course, they are supported in their opposition by the great majority of the rich clergy. There is, however, no great difficulty in understanding all this. In the first place, they are anxious to display their grateful loyalty to the government that placed them in such lucrative positions. And then, again, it is their interest to proselytize as much as possible. Not that they care much whether their proselytes are genuine or spurious, as long as they have names of converts to figure in the Parliamentary returns, and show what progress the Establishment is making.

The curates, who, in general, would serve the people, because they live among them and know their virtues as well as their failings, have not the power to do so. They are, in fact, oppressed themselves. Let their talents and piety be what they may, let their zeal as ministers of the Gospel be ever so great, let them exert themselves in the cause of religion, no matter to what extent, curates they will live and die, — except they happen to have powerful friends, that is, professional politicians who support the government of the day, to procure them livings, or except they can raise the hard cash to purchase them. But poor as the curates are, there are no small number of them who share their little with the destitute. We have known a curate, who had a wife and five children to support on £75 a year, to tear the carpet off his floor, as well as to take the food from his scantily supplied table, for the relief of the cold and hungry; and this we mention only as an illustrative instance, — one out of many similar cases. But this is the one redeeming feature, if such it may be called, of which the Irish Established Church can boast. It is proper, at all events, for religion's sake, to draw the distinction between the poor, pious curate, and the pampered, exacting pluralist; for it is a distinction between the minister of the Gospel, properly so called, and the heartless Churchman, who is the servant of Mammon rather than of God; and it shows that there is still a "village preacher" of whom it can be said, —

"But in his duty prompt at every call,  
He watched and wept, he prayed and felt for all."

Thus we have not found it necessary to have recourse either to Romish or Presbyterian testimony to show that the Irish Church is the Caspar Hauser of institutions,—nothing better than a huge bribing machine,—a monster which the people are compelled to support in splendor out of their poverty, at an expense of five millions of dollars, for their own enslavement.

In this rapid glance at the present condition of Ireland, while glad to recognize all the good that has been done by the British government for the country since the famine, we have had to pass over several real grievances under which the people continue to labor; but have we not at the same time adduced sufficient evidence to show what a hideous mockery it is to pretend that the Irish are, or can be, either prosperous or happy, while they have to bear so many cruel burdens for the sole benefit of England,—while they have to submit to whatever laws, no matter how unequal and oppressive, the British Parliament, for its own purposes, chooses to make for them, and to taxation without representation?

Much stress is laid on the fact that the Irish are not disposed to insurrection; but can this be strange, in view of the constant efforts which are made to keep them divided against one another? How can a poor, disorganized people, without munitions of war, or money, be expected to rebel, successfully, against an ever-vigilant power like England,—a nation so vastly stronger, numerically and otherwise, than themselves,—even though all should act together? If they sometimes make the attempt, however, notwithstanding the overwhelming odds against them, it only shows that they have been goaded on to reckless despair, knowing well, as they do, the horrible butcheries, and the nameless cruelties of all kinds, of which they, and their wives and daughters, are sure to be the victims if they fail. As for such effort at insurrection as has been made since the famine, it is no criterion by which to judge of the national will on the subject. A people almost exhausted by famine, whose spirit hunger and misery had deadened within them, cannot be supposed to have had much appetency for the horrors of war. On the contrary, they shrink from them; for they had sunk into a state of apathy from

which they have not yet wholly recovered. But England ought to take warning, even from that feeble, irresolute, not to say ludicrous attempt, — especially now, since she has received such a terrible lesson from India, — rather than turn it into ridicule, or exult so triumphantly in its failure. She ought to bear in mind now, if never before, that the tempest threatens before it breaks, that houses creak before they fall, —

“*Tempestas minatur antequam,  
Crepant ædificia antequam corruant.*”

---

ART. VI. — *Principes d'Ostéologie Comparée, ou Recherches sur l'Archetype et les Homologies du Squelette Vertébré.* Par RICHARD OWEN. Paris. 1856. 8vo. pp. 440.

FROM the night of early history there have come down in single words visions of wonderful greatness, — the fragments seemingly of another world, mysteriously vast, and after all little else to us than mere words without definite ideas. Of their true history, of their epoch, or of their locality, we know nothing sure, and at times their very existence as former realities has been doubted. Among such words are Babel, Nineveh, and Troy; but a few years ago wholly unknown, yet a part of all our history, and associated with scenes of violence, might, and glory, magnificent as the clouds of heaven, and like them obscuring all that lies beyond. If these faint glimpses of the past may raise such deep interest, we can appreciate the excitement of Eastern discovery, where the explorer even hopes to find the spell by which to raise from the dust around him the ghosts of those older than Samuel, and to bid them speak. But as it is with the traveller, when after long search the ancient city itself stands before him, alone amid the sand-hills, and perfect in its record of former life and greatness, so is it with the student of the human body when contemplating for the first time the vast edifice of comparative anatomy. The fragments and half-inscriptions of special dissection have, with all their addition to our real knowledge,